

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on November 27, 2007. With this RCE claims 1-21 are presently cancelled and new claims 22-40 are added. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification, for example on page 8, lines 6 - 24 and page 9, lines 22 - 25.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7 and 10-13 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0186821 to Matson et al. (hereinafter “Matson”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0160014 to Moss et al. (hereinafter “Moss”).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-7 , 10-13 and 15-17 are moot in view of the present amendment which cancels claims 1-21. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of Matson or Moss teaches or suggests each of the elements of any one of new claims 22 – 40.

Claim 22 representative in part of the other new claims, recites:

22. A system for processing expense information comprising a generic file parser adapted to receive said expense information from a plurality of expense data providers, wherein said expense information includes data in a plurality of formats;

at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being adapted to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules; and

at least one extension of a specific parsing module, the extension(s) being adapted to process specific fields of said expense information.

With respect to cancelled claims 5 and 6, the Examiner erroneously asserted that paragraphs [0037] and [0038] of Matson discloses “said parsing component including a generic parsing component having common functionality to parse data; and wherein at least one specific function is implemented into a specific parsing component which encapsulates said generic

parsing component, said at least one specific function modifying functionality of said generic parsing component so that said specific parsing component can parse data in a specific format.”

Contrary to the Examiner’s characterization, paragraphs [0037] and [0038] of Matson recite:

[0037] The conversion to XML 211 is an automatic process and may be performed after the simple differential analysis 205. The process 211 converts the supplier data file into an XML file. An XML file may be defined as a file containing valid XML (extensible markup language). The supplier data is parsed as completely as possible. Parsing may be defined as extracting information from the supplier-specific data format so that it may be dealt with appropriately (e.g., constructing the XML file). In particular, the following fields in a supplier data record should be parsed (or constructed): supplier name, supplier product number, manufacturer name, manufacturer product number, vendor name, and vendor product number. In addition, all other fields should be parsed as completely as the supplier format allows. This means that every “field” that the supplier supplies/identifies as part of the dataset will be parsed from the input file and stored as separate elements in the supplier XML file.

[0038] All parsing is assumed to be product independent. In particular, parsing product attributes from descriptions using regular expression matching is not done at this stage (it may be performed during the Product Attribution stage that is part of the Insert and Update Phases). Certain standard product attributes should be constructed if possible, including a short description. An attribute may be defined as a piece of data that describes or identifies a given product.

Applicants submit that Matson’s disclosure that “[a]ll parsing is assumed to be product independent” is a description of a generic file parser that does not teach or suggest anything about specific file parsing components as Applicants disclose and claim. In particular, Matson does not teach or suggest anything about “at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being adapted to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules;” or “at least one extension of a specific parsing module, the extension(s) being adapted to process specific fields of said expense information” as particularly claimed.

Claims 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Matson and Moss in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,181,417 to Langseth et al. (hereinafter “Langseth”). Claim 19 is

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Matson in view of Moss, Langseth and U.S. patent No. 6,633,878 to Underwood (hereinafter “Underwood”). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 18, 20 and 21 are moot in view of the present amendment. Further, Applicants submit that no combination of Matson, Moss, Langseth and/or Underwood teaches or suggests each element of any of Applicants newly submitted claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are believed to be in order, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain an issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned with any concerns in furtherance of the prosecution of the present application.

Please charge any deficiency as well as any other fee(s) which may become due at any time during the pendency of this application, or credit any overpayment of such fee(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-2896.

Respectfully submitted,

February 27, 2008

Dated:

/Brian L. Michaelis/

Brian L. Michaelis (Reg. No. 34,221)

Customer No. 71130

Attorney for Applicant(s)

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

World Trade Center East

Two Seaport Lane, Suite 300

Boston, MA 02210

Tel: 617-946-4830

Fax: 617 946-4801

E-mail: bosippto@seyfarth.com